U.S.
HQ 759 L6

THE

NATIONAL LEAGUE

FOR THE

PROTECTION

OF THE

FAMILY

Annual Report for 1903

THE

National League for the Protection of the Family.

President.

Hon. NATHANIEL SHIPMAN, LL.D., Hartford, Conn.

Vice-Presidents.

Rt. Rev. WILLIAM LAWRENCE, D.D., LL.D., Boston.
Hon. SETH LOW, LL.D., New York.
Pres. GEORGE HARRIS, D.D., LL.D., Amherst.

Corresponding Secretary.

Rev. SAMUEL W. DIKE, LL.D., Auburndale.

Recording Secretary.

Rev. C. H. SPALDING, D.D., Boston.

Treasurer.

WILLIAM G. BENEDICT, Esq., 610 Atlantic Avenue, Boston.

Executive Committee.

Pres. GEORGE HARRIS, D.D., LL.D., Amherst.
Pres. M. H. BUCKHAM, D.D., LL.D., Burlington, Vt.
Prof. FRANCIS G. PEABODY, D.D., Cambridge.
Pres. W. E. HUNTINGTON, Ph.D., Newton Centre.
Rev. JAMES DE NORMANDIE, Roxbury.
Prof. ALBION W. SMALL, Ph.D., LL.D., Chicago.
Rev. DANIEL MERRIMAN, D.D., Worcester.
Rev. WILLIAM H. COBB, D.D., Newton Centre.
EVERETT O. FISK, Esq., Boston.
FRANK GAYLORD COOK, Esq., Cambridge.
Rev. SAMUEL W. DIKE, LL.D., Auburndale.

REPORT

OF THE

National League for the Protection of the Family

FOR THE

Year Ending December 31, 1903.

BOSTON:
THE EVERETT PRESS COMPANY, PRINTERS,
74 India Street.
1904.

Notices.

This Report, as usual, deals only with the chief topics of the year. Preceding Reports will be found interesting for a similar reason. These can be supplied for some of the years since 1890. A few copies of the Report of 1895, which was a "Review of Fifteen Years," can be furnished. Other Reports can often be found in the larger public libraries. Stamps for postage will always be welcome.

The Report of the Hon. Carroll D. Wright, LL.D., Commissioner of Labor, on Marriage and Divorce in this country and Europe, is now out of print. It is hoped that another year Congress will provide for bringing it down to date. Meanwhile, we can furnish copies of a brief "Summary of Statistics," from that Report, and a reprint of the summary of later statistics, so far as these are accessible, in a reprint from the present Report.

A small tract on "The Pastor and the Home;" a paper on the origin and principles of "The Home Department of the Sunday School;" a report to the National Council of Congregational Churches on "The Family;" and a leaflet on "The Aims, Methods, and Results of Our Work" can still be supplied freely to all applicants. But our other and more important papers are out of print.

Reports of the Commissions on Uniform Legislation can be obtained from their Secretary, Albert E. Henschel, 214 Broadway, New York.

Unsolicited contributions are doubly useful in a society like the League; for they save the time of the Corresponding Secretary for his proper work. An increase of one-third would greatly add to the efficiency of the work.

Associate Annual Membership is invited from those who cannot give large sums. This is freely granted to all proper persons, both ladies and gentlemen, on payment of *five dollars* for the year. Such persons become members in full for the time. *If you cannot be a larger contributor, will you not send your request for associate membership, with the fee, and thus share in this work for the family?* Every one who has profited by the work of the League, or who believes in its mission, is urgently requested to aid us by a contribution of money.

The Treasurer, Mr. William G. Benedict, 610 Atlantic Avenue, Boston, Mass., will gratefully acknowledge all contributions sent to him.

Correspondence relating to the work of the League should be addressed to the Corresponding Secretary, the Rev. Samuel W. Dike, LL.D., 113 Hancock Street, Auburndale, Mass. Contributions may also be sent directly to him.

Minutes.

The Twenty-fourth Annual Meeting of the National League for the Protection of the Family was held in the Diocesan House, Boston, January 20, 1904, at 2.30 P.M. In the absence of the President and Vice-Presidents, the Recording Secretary called the meeting to order. Frank Gaylord Cook, Esq., was chosen president *pro tem*. Prayer was offered by Dr. Dike. The minutes of the last meeting were read and approved. The officers of last year were re-elected as follows: —

President, Hon. Nathaniel Shipman, LL.D.

Vice-Presidents, Rt. Rev. William Lawrence, D.D., LL.D., Hon. Seth Low, LL.D., President George Harris, D.D., LL.D.

Corresponding Secretary, Rev. S. W. Dike, LL.D.

Recording Secretary, Rev. C. H. Spalding, D.D.

Treasurer, Mr. William G. Benedict.

Executive Committee, President George Harris, D.D., LL.D., President M. H. Buckham, D.D., LL.D., Prof. Francis G. Peabody, D.D., Pres. W. E. Huntington, Ph.D., Rev. James De Normandie, D.D, Prof. Albion W. Small, Ph.D., LL.D., Rev. Daniel Merriman, D.D., Rev. William H. Cobb, D.D., Mr. Everett O. Fisk, Frank Gaylord Cook, Esq., Rev. Samuel W. Dike, LL.D.

Mr. William G. Benedict, Treasurer, read his annual Report, which was referred to Mr. Everett O. Fisk as auditor. Dr. S. W. Dike read his annual Report, and it was accepted, ordered printed, and distributed at the discretion of Dr. Dike.

Voted that the matter of an exhibit at St. Louis be referred to the Executive Committee.

The following minute was adopted: —

Voted,— That in the death of the Rev. Alvah Hovey, D.D., the League has lost one of its most steadfast friends and officers. Dr. Hovey was president of the League three years. He was the author of a book on " The Scriptural Law of Divorce." This was, we believe, the first book on divorce published in this country, and was characterized by his great candor and thoroughness of discussion. He died, after a service of over fifty years as Professor and President in the Theological Seminary in Newton, Mass., honored and beloved by all who ever knew him.

Voted,— That this minute be entered upon our records and a copy be sent to the family of Dr. Hovey.

Voted to adjourn.

C. H. SPALDING,

Recording Secretary.

Boston, Mass., Jan. 20, 1904.

Report of Corresponding Secretary.

The last year has been one of decided growth of interest in the subjects of our work and in measures for the improvement of the conditions of the Family. A sense of the gravity of the evils affecting our home life and of the need of giving them serious attention is steadily increasing. Our correspondence in answer to inquiries has fully equalled that of former years. Our receipts increased so much at one time that it seemed possible by the economy we were practising to meet all our past obligations; but unfortunately the illness of a number of our most steadfast friends and the absence of others have left us with some debt on former years still remaining. We may, however, confidently hope for enough this coming year to meet all our dues.

UNIFORM LEGISLATION.

Nothing was done, so far as we have been able to learn, by the Conference of the Thirty-five State Commissions on Uniform Legislation at their last meeting on the proposed Uniform Act on Divorce, which was drafted in a former year. Other subjects took the time of the sessions. It is hoped that the next meeting will take up the subject in earnest. It would seem to an outsider that the National Government ought to be represented on these Commissions and to appropriate a few thousand dollars for their work. This would give some greatly needed pecuniary aid and, what is more, lend dignity to the whole movement, which is acknowledged to be one of the most important steps ever taken by the States.

STATE LEGISLATION.

As this is the year in which most Legislatures have been in session the acts on this subjeet have been numerous—though, with exceptions, of less importance than in some years.

ALASKA. The term of residence before a divorce can be sought in Alaska has been made two years by an act of Congress.

ARIZONA has decreased the term of residence to one year. It adds habitual intemperance to its causes for divorce, and changes "extreme

physical cruelty" to "guilty of excesses, cruel treatment or outrages towards the other, whether by use of personal violence or any other means."

CALIFORNIA. This State has made an interesting change in a recent law that forbade the remarriage of divorced persons for one year, and which was evaded by many who went to Arizona for the forbidden marriage. To meet this difficulty California now requires that an interlocutory judgment be entered in all divorce cases, from which an appeal can be taken within six months. "When one year has expired after the entry of such interlocutory judgment, the court may on motion of either party enter the final judgment granting the divorce, and such final judgment shall restore them to the status of single persons, and permit either to marry after the entry thereof." Other provisions are added. In some States the object is secured by making all divorces *nisi* for six months or a year, which seems to amount to the same thing as the California method, or they refuse to recognize the remarriage contracted in another State contrary to their own laws. Decisions of the United States Supreme Court sustain the States in this right to protect themselves against the looser laws of other States.

COLORADO. This State has very carefully protected the wife against a husband who unjustly refuses to support her and their children; but the term of imprisonment for the failure to do so, which is only from thirty to ninety days, is much shorter than in other States. It has also enacted a very strict law to protect the rights of defendants in divorce suits who are out of the State and whose residence is unknown.

IDAHO. Its law allowing divorce for insanity is amended by providing that divorce for insanity cannot be granted unless the insane person have been duly and regularly confined in the insane asylum of this or some other State or Territory for at least six years preceding the action, and the plaintif must have been an actual resident of the State for one year preceding the suit.

INDIANA. A provision made in 1901 for the appearance of the prosecuting attorney in the divorce cases of Marion County—Indianapolis—is now extended to the entire State. That officer is now required to defend and resist all cases of divorce in which there is no other defence or in which the defence is not made in good faith. This State has also provided for limited divorce on the same grounds for which absolute divorces are granted. This provides for the relief of those who do not wish or need absolute divorce. It is stipulated in the new law that the party obtaining the temporary separation who commits adultery while thus separated loses thereby all rights and benefits of such separation.

KANSAS. This State prohibits the marriage of the epileptic, imbecile, feeble-minded, and insane. An act also allows the parties to actions for divorce or alimony to testify on all material matters involved in controversy. But this is not to allow divorce upon the uncorroborated testimony of either party.

MONTANA follows an increasing custom of forbidding the advertising of the procuring divorces and attaches effective penalties to the law.

NEVADA now lays a penalty on the failure to return the certificate of marriage within a fixed time.

NEW HAMPSHIRE requires five days' notice of intention of marriage from all non-residents seeking marriage within the State.

NEW JERSEY is also a State that has provided stricter rules for notice to defendants in divorce suits who are absent from the State or who cannot be found.

NORTH CAROLINA provides that in divorce for wilful abandonment the guilty party cannot marry for five years. It also makes abduction of, or elopement with, the wife of another a felony.

NORTH DAKOTA enacts practically the same law regarding elopement.

OREGON requires that a copy of the certificate of marriage be returned to the Clerk of the County whence it was issued, as well as to the Clerk of the County where the marriage was celebrated.

PENNSYLVANIA amends its law relating to divorce for crime by defining the crimes for which divorce may be granted. It also makes bigamy a misdemeanor punishable by a fine not exceeding one thousand dollars or imprisonment at separate and solitary labor not exceeding two years, or by both. This State also has a new law inserting important requirements in all its marriage licenses. The clerk now issuing marriage licenses must obtain the particulars as to the age of the parties, the consent of parents and guardians for those under the age of twenty-one years, and also regarding any former marriage and its dissolution. The mode of dissolution and its cause, if it is by divorce, must be ascertained and appear on the marriage license. These provisions are most important, both for the protection they afford against bigamy and for the use of clergymen who do not wish to officiate in the marriage of divorced persons. They have long been required in German marriage laws, with the additional provision that the fact, date, and cause of the dissolution of all marriages must be entered on the margin of the original record of the marriage dissolved, as we do in the discharge of a mortgage. Our States may do well to copy this law.

UTAH legalizes certain marriages prior to the law making a license in the county of her residence necessary for a woman, if under age or a widow. It adds insanity to its grounds for divorce. But the defendant must first be pronounced insane by the legally constituted authorities of this or some other State at least five years prior to the commencement of the action, and the insanity must be proved to the court to be incurable. In all such actions the court is to appoint a guardian to protect the interests of the defendant and of the State. It will be seen that one State has this year added insanity to its grounds for divorce; but this cause has been disappearing in recent years from our statute-books.

VERMONT makes more careful provision for the record and returns of marriages, births, and divorces. These are to be returned to the State Board of Health, and not to the Secretary of State, as heretofore has been done.

In the DISTRICT OF COLUMBIA Congress now requires that all marriage licenses shall be issued to some specified clergyman or magistrate, instead of being general.

The trend of legislation for several years has been strongly in the direction of the greater protection of the interests of the Family and towards uniformity of legislation by a natural process. The varying experiments are useful in showing us what is best.

Some efforts at legislation this year did not succeed, but will be renewed, notably in RHODE ISLAND and MICHIGAN. Some places in the latter State have found themselves overrun with parties who could formerly be married hastily in Wisconsin, but were shut out of that State by the law of 1899, which requires the license to be issued five days before the marriage takes place. Michigan is now the Gretna Green of this class of people. An attempt to incorporate the Wisconsin provision in the Michigan statutes failed by a very few votes only. The measure, it is believed, will be enacted another year. This illustrates the way in which the States are gradually approaching uniformity.

THE GERMAN IMPERIAL DIVORCE LAW.

It will be remembered that our Report for the year 1899 gave some account of the new German Uniform Law of Divorce for the entire Empire, which went into effect Jan. 1, 1900. Its grounds for divorce were four in number: adultery, attempt of either husband or wife on the life of the other, maliciously wilful desertion, including also refusal to support the wife, and continued violation of marriage vows, or faithless or immoral behaviour so complete as to violate the proprieties of marriage in a way that the innocent party can no longer

suffer a continuance of the marriage. These are surrounded with certain safeguards. In the case of desertion, a preliminary suit for the reëstablishment of marital relations must be prosecuted to a decision and a year allowed for the deserting party to return to conjugal duty before the divorce can be granted.

It is interesting to note the practical results of this law. The Chief of the Statistical Bureau of Berlin has kindly sent me the number of divorces granted in the entire Empire for several years. For the years 1891–1895 inclusive the annual average was 7,258. In 1896 there were 8,601; in 1897 there were 9,005; in 1898 there were 9,143; and in 1899 they had become 9,563. But under the new law in 1900 they dropped to 8,934, and in 1901 they were 8,037.

STATISTICS.

For various reasons it is thought best to defer our effort to get the Report of the Department of Labor at Washington on Marriage and Divorce in the United States and Europe for the years 1867–1889, which is now out of print, brought down to date until another year. Then conditions will be most favorable for a successful effort.

Meanwhile we can send a summary of the figures of that Report to any who will send a two-cent stamp to the Secretary of the League at Auburndale, Mass., and we also give the following statistics of the nine States which publish their divorce statistics annually.

MAINE granted 552 divorces in 1892, and these have rapidly increased until there were 905 in 1902. There was one divorce to every 7.1 marriages in 1901, and probably one to a little over 6 in 1902. Out of the 808 granted in 1901, 64 were for adultery; 226 for desertion; 112 for intoxication; 317 for cruelty or cruel and abusive treatment; and 31 for failure to support. Thirteen divorces were granted before the marriage had lasted a year; 227 after from 1 to 5 years marriage; 217 after 5 to 10 years; 211 after 10 to 20 years; 99 after 20 to 30 years; and 33 after more than 30 years of married life.

NEW HAMPSHIRE has lately collected her statistics of divorce from 1858 to the present time. These are interesting as showing the entirely modern feature of the divorce movement, which the early statistics of Connecticut fully corroborate. With the exception of the two smallest counties in the State, whose records were destroyed by fire, there were only 60 divorces in the State in 1858. All the counties give 159 in 1870. In 1880 there were 352; in 1891 they reached 412; and there were 482 in 1901. In this last year there was one divorce to every 8.3 marriages.

VERMONT, with an almost stationary population, granted 164 divorces in 1870; 138 in 1880; as few as 91 in 1885; but rapidly increased to 290 in 1895; then fell to 227 in 1901; but rose to 316 in 1902, or one to every 10 marriages. The fluctuations in these figures may be in part due to the carrying over of an unusual number of divorce suits in some years to the next year.

MASSACHUSETTS granted 404 divorces in 1870; 595 in 1880; 790 in 1892; and 1,601 in 1902. In 1872 there was one divorce to 47 marriages; in 1882, one to 34; and in 1902, one to 16.

RHODE ISLAND granted 202 divorces in 1870; 274 in 1880; 296 in 1892; and 482 in 1901. There were 493 divorces in 1902, one to 8.4 marriages.

CONNECTICUT averaged 497 divorces annually for the three years 1867–1869. For the next ten years they averaged 429. In the decade ending 1890 the average was 424. The average for the decade ending 1902 was 423. In 1902 there were over 354. When we remember that the population of Connecticut has increased nearly 70 per cent since 1870, it is apparent that Connecticut is really greatly reducing her divorce rate. The repeal of the notorious "omnibus clause" in 1878, the stricter practice of the courts in recent years, the large Roman Catholic element in the increased population, and the wholesome influence of the churches of the State have all probably combined to produce this result.

Allowing the same number for New Hampshire in 1902 as there were in the previous year, there were 4,351 divorces granted in the six New England States in the year 1902. And there seems to be a steady increase in all except Connecticut.

Only three other States give us recent statistics:

OHIO granted 1,008 divorces in 1870, or one to 25 marriages. In 1880 there were 1,578. In 1890 there were 2,306, or one to 14.5 marriages. In 1900 there were 3,878, and in 1902 there were 4,276. In the last year there was a divorce for every 8.8 marriages. The increase was very steady until within the last six years, when it has been phenomenally rapid.

INDIANA granted 1,170 in 1870; 1,423 in 1880; 1,721 in 1890; and 2,896 in 1898. Then there were 4,031 in the next year and 4,669 in the year 1900. In this last year there was a divorce to every 5.7 marriages for the entire State. But an improvement is seen in the figures for the last two years reported. In 1901 the number fell to 3,585, and in the following year there were 3,552. In 1902 the ratio to marriages was one to 7.6. The reasons for the improvement are not apparent. Probably the new law requiring the appear-

ance of the State attorney to defend in certain suits will lead to still more improvement.

MICHIGAN granted 554 divorces in 1870; 1,149 in 1880; and 2,418 in 1900. The ratio to marriages in the last year noted was about one to 11.

RECENT FOREIGN FIGURES.

Some foreign figures that have been collected since 1889 show the trend of things in Europe. There were 1,018 divorces in Switzerland in 1898, and the rate since the uniform law of 1876 has not changed perceptibly. Nor did that law reduce divorces. The great reduction in Germany has already been noted on an earlier page. Divorces in Sweden had increased to 316 in 1892 from an average of about 200 twenty years earlier. Belgium had 128 separations in 1870; 295 in 1880, or one to 162 marriages; 373 in 1890, or one to 130 marriages; and 821 in 1901, or one to 41 marriages. It should be said that separation is the only form of divorce known in Belgium. France, under the divorce law of 1884, granted 6,245 in 1885, and reached its highest number in 1897, when 7,460 were granted. Since then they appear to decrease, only 7,157 being granted in the year 1900. A still greater decrease is probable for 1902. In 1897 there were 406 divorces by conversion. That is, in France it is allowable to obtain a separation for five years and at the end of that time to apply for the conversion of the separation into an absolute divorce if the parties have not in the meanwhile become reconciled. In the Netherlands there were 156 divorces in all in 1870; 226 in 1880; and 476 in 1890. Here divorce by conversion of separations is allowed. In England and Wales there were 176 divorces in 1870; 336 in 1880; 364 in 1890; and 727 in 1899.

RHODE ISLAND CLERGYMEN ON THE MARRIAGE OF DIVORCED PERSONS.

An interesting arrangement has been entered into by a large proportion of the clergy of this State, which shows that something can be done toward harmonious action, even where there is a wide divergence of opinion. It is mainly in the line of suggestions which the Secretary of the League has been making for several years, and only needed efficient and wise leadership, such as has been shown in Rhode Island, to make it practical.

Instead of attempting the difficult, if not impossible, task of getting all to adopt some one rule of action, the effort was made to get as many as could do so to sign one or more of some five pledges, or general agreements.

Of the 350 Protestant and Hebrew clergy in the State, 114 will refuse to solemnize the marriage of strangers unless properly introduced and identified, or accompanied by friends as witnesses to the marriage. It was found that too many ministers put the responsibility of marrying strangers on the official of the State who furnishes the license.

The second pledge was signed by 63. These refuse to marry a person of another denomination who, having been divorced, could not be married according to the ecclesiastical rules or laws of that denomination. It will be seen that this is based on the principle of comity between denominations which the Commissions on Uniform Legislation recommended for adoption by the States in order to protect the States with a stricter divorce law against the looser ones.

Eighteen, of whom seven are Episcopalians and the others of different Protestant denominations, refuse without exception the marriage of all divorced persons.

The fourth class, of 114, refuse to officiate at the remarriage of all divorced persons except in the case of the innocent party in a divorce for adultery.

Some 53 signed a clause favoring in substance the marriage of divorced persons who could be married under the State law. But many of these really take higher ground, yet were unwilling to bind themselves to the more specific measures.

In addition to these five forms of agreement, there were three other general propositions that were widely accepted. These related to the use of care in marrying strangers, to making it difficult for guilty divorced persons to remarry, and to advancing interdenominational comity on the subject.

Those who wish for the details of this experiment should enclose a two-cent stamp to the Rev. Frank J. Goodwin, 16 Maynard Street, Pawtucket, R. I., for the two pamphlets explaining the plan and giving its results. Of course this movement has its limitations; but it not only will do something to check improper marriages, but will be a means of education and suggestion to the people of the State. It is hoped that the clergymen of other localities will try something like it, as may easily be done. As we pointed out long ago, it is not wise, to say the least, for the Church to permit the State to outstrip it in efforts to reform itself.

A NATIONAL EFFORT ALONG THE SAME LINE.

Under the lead of Bishop Doane, of Albany, as we noted in an earlier report, an effort is being made to get the various denominations

of Christians of the country as a whole to make some agreements in regard to the action of their ministers in marrying improper persons. This is a much slower work than the formation of local plans like that of Rhode Island. Some of the denominations have no national bodies empowered to act for all their churches in such a matter. Some of those who have such power meet only once in three or four years. And the diversity of opinion is very great.

But the committees appointed already represent several denominations, and plans have been made to secure as many as possible of the rest, including, if practicable, the Roman Catholic Church. Although this Church refuses marriage to all divorced persons, yet it is thought by some that in appreciation of the probable adoption of the principle of protecting the stricter Churches against the remarriage of their members by Protestants, her representatives may see their way to co-operate in this movement.

The committee will soon hold another meeting, and it is believed that it will begin by adopting the rule that ministers refuse to marry those from other denominations who cannot be married by their own pastors. Other steps are being considered.

THE HOME IN RELIGIOUS EDUCATION.

This special topic has received unusual impetus the past year. The formation of the Religious Education Association last winter is an event of the first importance to all friends of the Home. This Association, which takes in the ablest workers in all lines of religious education, and which aims to do for its religious side what the great National Educational Association has been doing for public education in general, has a department for the work of the Home in religious education—something entirely new in the organization of such bodies, but wholly within the line of our own pleas for many years. The addresses on the subject given at Chicago and the plans for the next annual meeting soon in Philadelphia promise to be most useful in calling attention to the Home as an important factor in religious education, and to means for its larger use.

In our report for 1885 it was said, in mentioning the plan of the Home Department of the Sunday School, which the Secretary had devised and brought to the notice of leading workers of the Sunday School that year, that "should this prove a success, as now seems probable, the interest awakened in the work of the Home will turn the public mind to other unused resources of the family." Our annual reports have frequently given evidence of this result. The practical outcome of the great interest in the Home Department, which now

numbers hundreds of thousands of members, has been to show religious leaders what an advantage is gained when any religious training is secured in the Home itself. When the idea of going outside the Sunday-school room, outside the branch school, outside the neighborhood class, and locating the work in one's own home, was put into use in the Home Department of the Sunday School, a great advance was made on the conventional way of doing religious work in meetings and classes of people drawn away from their own homes for the purpose. Like the first practical application of electricity, the Home Department of the Sunday School had within it the promise of a series of other inventions for bringing the Home into its true place in connection with other institutions for training the young and others for the work of life.

A HOME DEPARTMENT OF THE CHURCH.

Your Secretary has long been looking for these inventions or plans for extending the fundamental idea of the Home Department of the Sunday School into other fields of the Church. It would seem as if some inventive mind that had clearly grasped the principle would soon find other uses for it. No one application of a new principle in mechanics waits very long for efforts to use it in other directions. I propose here, as I have elsewhere, that our churches consider the suggestion of a Home Department of the Church itself. By this is meant a regular department of the organization that shall plan for the use of the Home under the proper care of the Church, so far as this is desirable and can be secured, in all the religious activities of the Church.

As our former reports have pointed out, this is more likely to come about in those efforts which some of our churches will evidently soon make to reorganize their societies and other agencies, which have grown up and are doing their work with nothing of the close interorganization and distribution of work which now characterizes our schools and industrial operations. The growing sense of the enormous waste of our present heterogeneous collections of ecclesiastical machinery, and the increasing conviction that the Home has in it undeveloped resources for coöperation with other educational agencies, must inevitably lead to some systematic provision for the use of the Home in an intelligent way. The Pulpit, the Sunday School, the Pastor's Catechetical Class, the Young People's Society, must all yet be expected to leave a distinct place for the work of the Home and make some provision for seeing that the Home does this work.

The new Religious Education Association, of which we have just spoken, in its attempts to coördinate all the educational forces of the

Church, can hardly fail to discover that the Home needs to be recognized and planned for with a care that its importance demands. This may go as far as to require something like what a Home Department of the Church would supply. A better and more scientific organization of some of our churches would seem to require that their societies be consolidated and their work be distributed in a more efficient way.

THE HOME AS A TOPIC OF POPULAR DISCUSSION.

It seems probable that the Home is coming to be more frequently made the topic of the entire meeting of ecclesiastical and similar assemblies. Your Secretary has been an invited speaker at two of these the past year. One of them was a conference of churches. The other was the second annual meeting of the Ohio Congress of Mothers, where nearly all the time of the three-days meeting was devoted to the Home. The meeting was held in Cleveland, and the leading educators of the city were drawn into service, as well as the clergy and others. The topics were such as these: "Parents' Meetings in the Cleveland Public Schools;" "The Care of the Physical Child;" "The Training of the Social Instinct;" "The Home as a Spiritual Teacher;" "The Modern Conception of Religious Education;" "The Responsibility of the Church for the Promotion of Religious and Moral Education through the Family;" "Coöperation of Home and School;" "Ideals of Home and School;" and "The Influence of Divorce on the Home."

This is especially significant for its indication of a tendency on the part of associations of women to return to the Home as a subject worthy of their especial attention, both for its needs and for the abundant material the Home affords for the most interesting scientific study. It may soon be found that no more fascinating subject of study can be taken up than that which the Home gives to every one who will consider it. The Home and the Communal organization, being in the field of social science much what cell and tissue are in biology, and necessarily connected in study, open in the best of ways the entire social problem to the student. And the interesting thing about it is the way in which the material lies immediately about us.

THE HOME AND CRIME.

This is a subject that needs to receive attention. Inquiries made of those who are in contact with the criminal classes, the reports of prison authorities, and a somewhat careful noting of the reports of crime in the daily press have increased the conviction that divorce, unchaste living, and other evils of a low condition of domestic morals have far more to do with crime and the conditions that lead to it than almost

any other single cause. Indeed, some thoughtful observers and some of the analyses of the statistics of crime of the more scientific character tend to lead one to put Home conditions first of all among the causes of crime. Your Secretary began to gather material for an extended report on the relation of divorce and its kindred evils to crime. But he soon found the task too great for his time and means. It is to be hoped that some State will order such an investigation to be made.

The business man and the tax-payer do not often seem to realize how much of their burdens from taxation and from the inefficiency of labor come from these vices and from the defective work of the Home in preparing the young for life, and in its influence over the adult. The hostility some years ago of organized labor to any use of the Department of Labor for the investigation of divorce, which it was competent under its organic law to undertake, was a curious illustration of this lack of apprehension of the industrial and social significance of domestic evils. But the indifference of Legislatures to the need of better laws and of provision for official statistics of social conditions in most States is quite as bad a symptom.

It is suggested that the friends of the Home look into the conditions in their own State and consider the practicability of inaugurating measures for investigation, by official authority where practicable.

LECTURES.

Within the past year or so lectures and addresses have been given by the Secretary in the theological seminaries of Andover, Hartford, Madison, N. J., Union Theological Seminary, New York, Yale Divinity School, the Episcopal Divinity Schools in Cambridge and Middletown, in Mount Holyoke College, and in the Western Reserve University. Other engagements are pending. These talks to students have always seemed to be greatly appreciated, and often lead to interesting correspondence and to practical work in our field.

Inquiries for our Reports where they are not regularly sent constantly come from librarians of educational institutions, and from students in them. This is especially true of the South and West in recent years. In some of these colleges, as well as in Harvard University, students take up the Family for investigation in its various aspects every year.

A GREAT WORK ON THE FAMILY.

The University Press of Chicago announces the early publication of a History of Matrimonial Institutions, by Professor George E. Howard, for several years the head of the Department of Social and Political Science in Leland Stanford University. It is in three large

volumes, and is mainly devoted to English and American institutions relating to the Family. It is the result of thirteen years of investigation and study, much of it in an hitherto unexplored field. Its publication was announced for January, 1904, but the publishers write that its issue is delayed for three or four months, though it may possibly appear sooner. The friends of the Family and the students of social problems everywhere are under the greatest obligations to Professor Howard for his self-denying labors in this field.

Respectfully submitted,

SAMUEL W. DIKE,

Corresponding Secretary.

Treasurer's Report.

WM. G. BENEDICT, *Treasurer.*

In account with the National League for the Protection of the Family.

DR.		CR.	
1903.		1903.	
To Receipts as per details in Cash Book	$2,212 04	By Disbursements for the year 1903, as per Cash Book:	
		General Expenses, —	
		Travelling	$106 05
		Postage	44 25
		Stationery	9 03
		Printing	72 78
		Tel. Express, etc.	80
		Rent	50 00
			$282 91
		Salary of Secretary .	1,800 00
			$2,082 91
		Balance	129 13
	$2,212 04		$2,212 04
		By S. W. Dike, LL.D., Secretary, on account of amount his due a year ago	$129 13
Dec. 31. To Balance . .	$129 13		$129 13
	$129 13		
		Deducting same from amount due the Secretary Dec. 31, 1902, which was $387.63, it leaves amount still due Dr. Dike Dec. 31, 1903	$258 50

January 20, 1904. I have this day made examination of the treasury accounts, and find the same to be correct.

EVERETT OLIN FISK, *Auditor.*

CONTRIBUTIONS.

Jan. 2.	Hon. Seth Low, LL.D., New York	$50 00	
3.	Rev. W. H. Moore, Hartford, Conn.	2 00	
15.	Hon. Nathaniel Shipman, LL.D., Hartford, Conn.	25 00	
19.	John D. R. Lamson, Toledo, Ohio	10 00	
21.	Col. Jacob L. Greene, Hartford, Conn.	35 00	
22.	Prof. W. E. Huntington, Ph. D., Newton Centre	5 00	
28.	Rev. W. Spooner Smith, Worcester	10 00	
29.	Frank Gaylord Cook, Cambridge	2 00	
	Received in January		$139 00
Feb. 4.	First Baptist Church, Newton Centre	$10 00	
4.	Grace Church, Providence, R. I.	25 00	
5.	Hon. William E. Dodge, New York	100 00	
5.	Rt. Rev. William Lawrence, D.D., LL.D., Boston	25 00	
5.	Rev. Thomas W. Thompson, Worcester	5 00	
6.	Mrs. George H. Corliss, Providence, R. I.	10 00	
6.	Pres. Edward M. Gallaudet, LL.D., Washington, D.C.	10 00	
9.	Mrs. Charlotte F. Blackman, Waterbury, Conn.	10 00	
9.	Hon. Moses Giddings, Bangor, Me.	5 00	
11.	James C. Braman, Auburndale	10 00	
11.	Robert C. Ogden, New York	25 00	
12.	Rev. W. P. Alcott, Boxford	2 00	
12.	Rev. W. H. Cobb, D.D., Newton Centre	5 00	
14.	Hon. Arthur T. Lyman, Boston	5 00	
14.	Mrs. William E. Dodge, Sr., New York	10 00	
14.	Rev. D. Stuart Dodge, New York	20 00	
14.	Rev. A. Moss Merwin, Pasadena, Cal.	3 00	
16.	Rev. Joshua Coit, Winchester	3 00	
16.	Rt. Rev. Daniel S. Tuttle, D.D., St. Louis, Mo.	5 00	
17.	First Congregational Church, Waterbury, Conn.	28 06	
18.	Prof. Edward Y. Hincks, D.D., Andover	5 00	
24.	Frank W. Stearns, Newton	10 00	
25.	Rev. Charles G. Ames, Boston	10 00	
25.	Rt. Rev. W. H. Hare, D.D., Sioux Falls, S.D.	5 00	
26.	Rt. Rev. A. C. A. Hall, D.D., Burlington, Vt.	5 00	
26.	Rev. Geo. B. Johnson, Burlington, Vt.	5 00	
28.	Alfred T. White, Brooklyn, N. Y.	10 00	
	Received in February		$366 06
Mar. 3.	Alfred Metcalf, Providence, R. I.	$ 5 00	
3.	Rev. Charles F. Dole, Jamaica Plain	5 00	
4.	Hartford Theological Seminary, Hartford, Conn.	5 00	
5.	Grace Church, New York	25 00	
5.	Morris K. Jessup, New York	10 00	
5.	Rt. Rev. Wm. Crosswell Doane, D.D., LL.D., Albany, N. Y.	5 00	
6.	Rev. Arthur Lawrence, D.D., Stockbridge	25 00	
6.	Rev. F. N. Peloubet, D.D., Auburndale	10 00	
7.	Charles E. Ranlett, Auburndale	5 00	
10.	George Burnham, Sr., Philadelphia, Pa.	25 00	

Mar. 13.	All Saints' Church, Worcester	$10 00	
17.	E. R. Brown, Dover, N. H.	5 00	
18.	A. F. Weber, Albany, N. Y.	3 00	
25.	W. H. Eaton, Lee	5 00	
26.	Old South Church, Boston	25 00	
31.	St. James Church, New York	25 00	
	Received in March		$193 00
Apr. 9.	Miss Martha C. Burgess, Dedham	$10 00	
10.	Prof. Henry W. Farnham, R.P.D., New Haven, Conn.	25 00	
22.	Robert H. Talley, Richmond, Va.	5 00	
28.	Rathbone Gardner, Providence, R. I.	5 00	
28.	Hon. James Tillinghast, Providence, R. I.	10 00	
30.	Charles Morris Smith, Providence, R. I.	10 00	
	Received in April		$ 65 00
May 8.	Rt. Rev. and Mrs. Alexander Mackay Smith, D.D., Philadelphia, Pa.	$15 00	
8.	Stuart Wood, Philadelphia, Pa.	10 00	
8.	Rev. G. L. Demarest, D.D., Manchester, N. H.	5 00	
9.	William P. Henzey, Philadelphia, Pa.	25 00	
11.	Rev. Walker Gwynne, Summit, N. J.	1 00	
13.	Ginn and Co., Boston	10 00	
14.	Missionary Society, St. Ann's Church, Brooklyn, N. Y.	5 00	
14.	Hon. Samuel B. Capen, LL.D., Boston	10 00	
19.	Rev. William S. Hubbell, D.D., New York	10 00	
21.	Miss Alice Byington, Stockbridge	10 00	
21.	Miss Virginia Butler, Stockbridge	5 00	
28.	Rev. Daniel Merriman, D.D., Worcester	50 00	
	Received in May		$156 00
June 3.	Mrs. R. H. Dana, Cambridge	$ 5 00	
5.	George Ripley, Andover	10 00	
8.	Rev. R. H. Weller, D.D., Jacksonville, Fla.	5 00	
9.	Central Congregational Church, Meriden, Conn.	5 00	
13.	Hon. James Schouler, LL.D., Boston	5 00	
16.	Mrs. Samuel Colt, Hartford, Conn.	40 00	
16.	Herbert A. Wilder, Newton	10 00	
17.	Samuel V. Hoffman, New York	25 00	
19.	Edward Whitin, Whitinsville	10 00	
20.	Christ Church, Hartford	10 00	
20.	Mrs. George Westinghouse, Lenox	100 00	
23.	Hon. William B. Plunket, Adams	10 00	
24.	William A. Read, New York	25 00	
	Received in June		$260 00
July 3.	Mrs. C. P. Turner, Philadelphia, Pa.	$25 00	
6.	Rev. Stephen W. Dana, D.D., Philadelphia, Pa.	5 00	
7.	Dr. William W. Rives, Lenox	10 00	
8.	George H. Morgan, Lenox	10 00	
17.	St. John's Church, Stamford, Conn.	14 80	
21.	Rev. J. B. Clark, D.D., New York	5 00	

July 24.	Rt. Rev. Leighton Coleman, D.D., LL.D., Wilmington, Del.	$3 00	
30.	Hon. J. J. Van Alen, Newport, R. I.	25 00	
30.	William B. Taylor, Lynn	5 00	
	Received in July		$102 80
Aug. 2.	Robert H. Gardiner, Boston	$ 5 00	
4.	W. J. Breed, Cincinnati, Ohio	5 00	
29.	Prof. C. R. Henderson, D.D., Chicago	2 00	
	Received in August		$12 00
Sept. 5.	Dr. Lucien Howe, Buffalo, N. Y.	$ 5 00	
28.	Rev. Herbert Lathe, Manitou, Col.	5 00	
	Received in September		$10 00
Oct. 5.	Mrs. John S. Mitchell, Waterbury, Conn.	$50 00	
6.	Rev. John G. Davenport, D.D., Waterbury, Conn.	10 00	
7.	Hon. Frederick J. Kingsbury, LL.D., Waterbury, Conn.	25 00	
12.	Hon. Arthur F. Whitin, Whitinsville	20 00	
14.	St. Stephen's Church, Pittsfield	10 00	
14.	Mrs. Gilman C. Hill, Waterbury, Conn.	5 00	
16.	Pres. Charles F. Thwing, D.D., LL.D., Cleveland, Ohio	25 00	
17.	"A Vermont Lady"	50 00	
17.	Rev. John H. Denison, D.D., Williamstown	10 00	
21.	St. Bartholomew's Church, New York	100 00	
21.	E. P. Dutton, New York	10 00	
22.	Mrs. A. S. Chase, Waterbury, Conn.	25 00	
22.	St. John's Church, Waterbury, Conn.	10 00	
22.	Mrs. Israel Holmes, Waterbury, Conn.	5 00	
22.	Pres. Henry Hopkins, D.D., LL.D., Williamstown	5 00	
22.	Hon. William E. Cushing, Cleveland, Ohio	5 00	
24.	South Evangelical Church, West Roxbury	2 18	
31.	Rev. A. St. John Chambré, D.D., Lowell	25 00	
	Received in October		$392 18
Nov. 7.	Hon. Edward L. Pickard, Auburndale	$20 00	
7.	William B. Herrick, Auburndale	10 00	
10.	Rev. George Alexander, D.D., New York	5 00	
16.	Mrs. John S. Brigham, Worcester	5 00	
17.	Rev. A. W. Hazen, D.D., Middletown, Conn.	5 00	
21.	Rev. John P. Taylor, D.D., Andover	5 00	
23.	Church of the Advent, Boston	25 00	
30.	Rev. John R. Thurston, Whitinsville	5 00	
30.	Mrs. Wallace H. Camp, Waterbury, Conn.	50 00	
	Received in November		$130 00
Dec. 3.	Prof. William North Rice, Middletown, Conn.	$ 5 00	
4.	Hon. William P. Ellison, Newton	10 00	
5.	Hon. Simeon E. Baldwin, LL.D., New Haven, Conn.	50 00	
5.	Hon. Francis Lynde Stetson, LL.D., New York	30 00	
5.	George Burnham, Jr., Philadelphia, Pa.	25 00	

Dec. 5.	Prof. Francis G. Peabody, D.D., Cambridge	$5 00	
5.	Rev. Anson Phelps Stokes, New Haven, Conn. . . .	5 00	
5.	W. W. Lockwood, New York	5 00	
9.	Prof. W. O. Atwater, Ph.D., Middletown, Conn. .	5 00	
9.	A. C. Tenny, Chelsea	1 00	
9.	Rufus B. Fowler, Worcester	5 00	
11.	William G. Benedict, Boston	10 00	
12.	Coolidge S. Roberts, Cambridge	20 00	
12.	St. Paul's Church, Concord, N. H.	5 00	
12.	Rev. A. B. Hunter, Raleigh, N. C.	5 00	
12.	Rev. Morgan Dix, D.D., New York	25 00	
15.	Rev. Frederick B. Allen, Boston	5 00	
16.	Pres. George Harris, D.D., LL.D., Amherst . . .	15 00	
17.	St. John's Church, Providence, R. I.	20 00	
17.	St. Stephen's Church, Providence, R. I.	10 00	
17.	"A Friend," Haddam, Conn.	9 00	
18.	Rev. C. H. Spaulding, D.D., Cambridge	5 00	
19.	E. O. Fisk, Boston	5 00	
21.	Miss Mary I. Lockwood, New London, Conn. . . .	5 00	
22.	Rev. E. E. Strong, D.D., Auburndale	3 00	
24.	Arthur Reed Kimball, Waterbury, Conn.	5 00	
25.	Rev. J. Edward Wright, D.D., Montpelier, Vt. . .	3 00	
28.	Rev. George M. Adams. D.D., Auburndale	5 00	
30.	Trinity Cathedral, Cleveland, Ohio	25 00	
30.	Rev. James W. Bixler, D.D., New London, Conn. .	10 00	
30.	Trinity Church, Hartford, Conn.	5 00	
30.	Pastor's Class, North Church, Hartford, Conn. . . .	5 00	
30.	"A Friend," Grace Church, South Framingham . .	5 00	
31.	Miss M. Josephine Allen, Boston	5 00	
31.	Rev. Austin B. Bassett, D.D., Ware	5 00	
31.	"A Friend" for the debt	25 00	
	Received in December	———	$386 00

The League and Its Work.

The League was organized in 1881 by ex-President Woolsey of Yale and others of high standing, who were convinced that the time had come for some combined effort to counteract the evils that threaten the integrity and efficiency of the Family.

It stands for catholic, scientific, and practical methods in the protection of the Family and its development in a wholesome social order. Marriage, Divorce, Polygamy, Chastity, etc., are regarded as parts of the one inclusive problem of the Family. And the Family and its growth into the Home, it is held, should be the constant concern of religion, education, industry, and patriotism. The relative neglect of the Family in the past and the place it now holds in all departments of social science, and in practical philosophy, compel an increasing attention to it. The Family is now widely acknowledged to be one of the foremost, if not the most important, of all social problems, and one vital to many interests. "More and more," says Prof. F. G. Peabody, of Harvard University, "we have come to see within these last few years that the problem of the Family is the *crux* of modern civilization."

Practical results are already apparent. The Government Report on Marriage and Divorce, which the League proposed and secured, prepared the way for the thirty-five State Commissions on Uniform Legislation on these and other subjects. Meanwhile State legislation has been kept moving in the right direction. Better systems of marriage license and regulation, the removal of "omnibus" and insanity clauses for divorce, the prohibition of divorce advertising, the increase of the term of residence before divorce is permitted in several States and all the Territories, restrictions upon the remarriage of the divorced in some, and carefully planned bills to restrict migratory and fraudulent or collusive divorces, now bear witness in many States to the practical efficiency of the movement.

The educational work of the League behind these gains is still more significant. Several higher educational institutions have been visited every year, and touch is kept with each through correspondence with teachers and students. Lectures and sometimes courses of lec-

tures are given in these on the Family and kindred problems. Libraries are supplied with our Reports and other papers. Twenty years ago these subjects were rarely touched in any educational institution. Now they are studied generally, and sometimes in extended courses.

Reviews and the periodical press generally have been used by the Secretary and others in the treatment of the Family and allied social problems. Our Annual Reports often contain important discussions, as well as a general survey of the field. Correspondence is a means of giving information and incentives to legislators, specialists, teachers, and others who seek our aid, it being our aim to do all we can through others. Churches and pastors have profited by our work. The Home Department of the Sunday school, an increasing interest in the religious work of the home, greater attention to the home in sermons, pastoral care, and church work, and a growing sense of its value as the best laboratory of the church, and the source of its supplies of men and money, may be cited in evidence.

A small constituency of exceptional intelligence has hitherto been the chief support of this fundamental and constructive work. We now ask for an increase of donors who are ready, if necessary, to make some sacrifice to aid us. We cannot meet the calls that come to us for various kinds of work and for publications without more money.

Checks may be sent either to the Treasurer or Corresponding Secretary. Unsolicited donations will be especially helpful.

Contributions may be sent to Mr. William G. Benedict, Treasurer, 610 Atlantic Avenue, Boston, or directly to the Corresponding Secretary, Rev. Samuel W. Dike, LL.D., 113 Hancock Street, Auburndale, Mass.

CONSTITUTION

OF THE

National League for the Protection of the Family.

ARTICLE I. The Association shall be called the NATIONAL LEAGUE FOR THE PROTECTION OF THE FAMILY.

ART. II. Its object shall be, through the improvement of public sentiment and legislation, to protect the institution of the Family, especially as affected by existing evils relating to Marriage and Divorce, and to secure its proper efficiency in individual and social life. It may co-operate with auxiliary or other bodies having similar aim in such ways as may be deemed expedient.

ART. III. It shall consist of the following persons, having power to fill vacancies and to add to their number. . . .

ART. IV. The officers of this Society shall be a President, not more than five Vice-Presidents, a Recording Secretary, a Corresponding Secretary, a Treasurer, and an Executive Committee of not more than twelve persons, of which committee the Corresponding Secretary shall be a member, and of which not less than three shall constitute a quorum, having the duties indicated in their several offices, to be elected at the Annual Meeting, and to hold office until their successors are appointed.

ART. V. The LEAGUE shall hold its Annual Meeting on the third Wednesday in January, unless otherwise directed by the Chairman of the Executive Committee, and at such hour and place as shall be indicated in the call of the Committee.

ART. VI. Amendments of this Constitution, of which due notice shall have been given in the call of any Annual Meeting, may be adopted at such meeting by the vote of two-thirds of the members present.

ALL COMMUNICATIONS concerning the work of the LEAGUE and its general business should be addressed to the Corresponding Secretary, Rev. SAMUEL W. DIKE, D.D., Auburndale, Mass.

CONTRIBUTIONS should be sent to the Treasurer, Mr. WILLIAM G. BENEDICT, 210 Albany Ave., Boston.

FORM OF BEQUEST.

I hereby give and bequeath to the NATIONAL LEAGUE FOR THE PROTECTION OF THE FAMILY, a corporation created by the Laws of the State of Connecticut, or its successors, or assigns, the sum of .....dollars, the principal [or income, as may be desired] of which is to be used for the purposes for which said Corporation was chartered.